

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, MARCH 14, 1914

No. 19

In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.98 I urged that discourses concerning the proper teaching of the Classics, especially such as exhort us to teach the Classics as literature, should be made far more specific, far more concrete.

While that editorial was awaiting publication, a valued subscriber, who prefers to remain nameless, wrote to me as follows:

In a recent number of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* you say that you have been awaiting help and suggestions from teachers and that they have not given as much aid as you would like. I have a point to suggest as a topic for an editorial, though I can hardly imagine that you have not noticed the thing yourself. The common tendency of writers on classical teaching is towards destructive criticism, and towards suggestions so vague and hard to grasp as to make them of practically no value as constructive criticism.

The writer mentioned several articles, one of which had appeared in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, as exhibiting the characteristics that seemed to him so unfortunate. He then continued:

The content of all these is such as to make it not simply desirable, but imperative, that the criticisms be followed by specific instructions for the betterment of the ills described. Anyone who has had Summer School students who are teachers knows how pitifully lacking they often are in training, and yet how very ready to welcome helpful suggestions. In our four or five hundred Colleges in this country, there are certainly many of the less well-equipped teachers, and teachers remote from libraries of size or from sources of helpful information. To these the vagueness of such articles as I have mentioned must seem baffling, a rock of offence; and I venture to say they probably seem much the same to many of the better equipped teachers who happen not to have the point of view of the writers. They make me think of a physician who might tell a patient, 'You are suffering with such and such an ailment', and then dismiss the patient without an intelligible prescription. Mr. —'s address is very interesting, it must have been inspiring to listen to it, but how many of our classical teachers can get much definite help from it, to say nothing of reforming their teaching in the light of his suggestions? Are we not too prone to talk in -isms, humanism, humanitarianism and the rest, when to most of us these words are beautifully vague in the application we are supposed to make of them?

In a somewhat similar way, does it not happen only too frequently that at conventions and similar meetings some scholar of repute makes a helpful address

and then refuses to have the address published in some medium that would bring it not only to those that could not attend the convention but also to those who were present and who would like to read it over carefully, when free from the fatigue and confusion attendant on a convention. I know the answers these gentlemen would probably make; but does not the greater argument lie with the Association that invited these men to address it?

Since the editorial was published, three of our readers have written to me about it. With their permission I quote them. Professor Rolfe writes:

I think your attitude towards 'Introductions' is absolutely sound and just. I have had a hand in some myself, directly and indirectly, and I cannot recall one which was taken bodily from the handbooks, or on which the writer did not spend enough time and thought to make the Introduction worth while in itself. It is hardly to be supposed that High School students, even if they had access to all the books, as of course they have not, could get, without great loss of time, if at all, what is given them in a good Introduction.

Professor McDaniel writes:

Your last editorial commends itself to me thoroughly. You have stated the truth aptly and cogently. No dictum has appeared from anybody in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* that I could wish so widely repeated as what you say about being specific. I am weary beyond expression of pedagogical articles on literary teaching, etc., that do not offer one single instance of what the author himself *does*. Destructive papers are ruining our classical work and require little brains or originality to write. For our next meeting, I hope it will be insisted that all papers must offer constructive suggestions to be acceptable.

Dr. C. H. Forbes, of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., writes at greater length:

The game of criticism is delightful when the deal passes around the table. How good it feels to name our trump and play the hand with a dummy. We sometimes win, we sometimes block the opponents; but there is fun in the game all the time, and especially when a finesse goes through. Just now the trump was called High School Texts in Latin, though some of us felt it strangely like the new-fangled Nullos; it seemed such an effort to lose something. Well, it was pleasantly played and had a few interesting moments while the lead was up to weakness. Now, however, that the hands are turned we feel a suspicion of a revoke somewhere. Let's put the cards on the table and look the hand over. Wasn't there a bit of confusion about the trump? Surely it was not called 'Doctors' Theses' at

the start, but merely a thing *pueris virginibusque*.

Is it then so despicable a thing for an editor to be an editor, a compiler of good things, even though he is not "in a position to guarantee their accuracy as the result of his own researches"? So we must not congest or arrange information: we must make it! This way to the back seats, my fellow-teachers! Who among us will venture to "guarantee" the "accuracy" of a Mommsen, a Huelsen, a Mau, a Jordan, a Richter, or the Pauly-Wissowa by his "own researches"? High School students can hardly be sent to revel in these books and "do the very thing that the editor did". It is high time that we dropped this exalted talk. These big scholars do our research work—we try to understand them and transmit their results to less seasoned minds. Furthermore, where are the authoritative reference books in English done by these researchers of guaranteed powers? Bless my soul, all we have are made in the same way—intelligent summaries of other mens' investigations. Professor Knapp is sound as a nut here, as usually. These blessed reference works of unimpeachable integrity and grave-faced authority are not on every teacher's five-foot shelf. There's many a good fellow who is glad of a decent short summary upon which to hang his own elucidations.

Yes, the 'Notes' are abominable to the man who knows; but the young pupil feels still as we all have felt when we attacked a new page—it wasn't half bad to get a suggestion from some old mellowed reader. Who does not love the memory of Professor Lane for the genius that made a Latin Grammar, for once, sparkle with light?

We all get different impressions from teaching experience; one of mine is that young boys have a lamentable ignorance of English vocabulary. The choice of words is possible only when the words are known. It is, therefore, not a wholly gratuitous work to give a few suggestions leading to a wider acquaintance with words that will make a later choice a possibility. The man who teaches Latin on the premise that English is a known tongue will do well to keep outside the preparatory fence. Doubtless we overdo the thing in school-books of all kinds, but the harm is not so very serious. Let's try to do better, boys!

Now for the strictures on grammar. We should like to omit most of the grammatical notes after leaving Caesar's camp, but there is the beast in the way—the ogre at the college doors. We can't drop the grammar; its of the stuff that moth and rust do corrupt, and the fabric becomes woefully perforated if laid aside for a season. The teacher should do the work in class? Yes, verily, but he will have a hard task if the student isn't driven to his grammar at his desk. Perhaps the 'Note' doesn't drive him? Well, then it isn't doing any serious harm, certainly.

To conclude, we are all indebted to Mr. Radin for a poke in the ribs and are ready to say with him: 'Give the author a chance, Mr. Editor, throttle yourself a bit, and above all quit talking.' C. K.

PAUSANIAS AS AN HISTORIAN

(Concluded from page 144)

While Pausanias was working out his scheme of general history, he had also the individual history of Athens to consider. Consequently, after some three chapters of periegetical matter, dealing es-

pecially with Theseus, whose deeds, like a silver thread, run throughout the Attica, appearing in twenty-three of the forty-four chapters, he gives an excursus (1.20.4) on the devastation of Athens by Sulla (86 B.C.); but concludes with the comforting statement that the city blossomed forth again under Hadrian.

But Pausanias realized that something more than the Athenian history in the above mentioned biographies was required in order to make the Hellenistic period intelligible, and so, in 1.25.2, in connection with Olympiodorus, he gives a sketch of Athenian history from the battle of Chaeroneia (338 B.C.) to Olympiodorus (287 B.C.), in which he points out how Philip II crippled Athens by depriving her of most of her islands and her naval power, after which there followed a period of peace, until, upon the death of Alexander, the Lamian War under the leadership of Leosthenes broke out and the long and ineffectual struggle to throw off the Macedonian yoke began. Finally, however, Cephisodorus (1.36.5. ff.) with his diplomacy (an Athenian exaggeration) succeeded in bringing Roman aid against Philip V, whose defeat at Cynocephalae (197 B.C.) was so complete, that Perseus's defeat at Pydna (168 B.C.) and the final overthrow of the Macedonian power was a natural consequence. This digression near the end of the Attica rounds off the history of the Athenian wars of Macedonia, and, while it is a prognostic of the final subjugation of Greece under Rome, it brings the history of Athens and Greece to the point where, in 7.10, the more detailed history of the Achaean League begins; it is repeated there in substance.

Book 2 begins naturally and conveniently with Corinth, the scene of the final conquest by Rome, and Pausanias's brief notice of this and his account of the new Corinth seem eminently fitting for his plan, although he has been criticized for this restriction. A little later, in connection with Sicyon, we find four out of some seven Teubner pages of the historical matter in this book devoted to Aratus and the beginning of the political expansion of the Achaean League. Aratus even helped to free Attica of the Macedonian garrisons. In general, the second book, properly called Argolica, impresses us as dealing with a series of detached communities, loosely held together by their relations to Argos. The recognition that the heroic age was the most glorious period in the history of Argos (cf. 7.17.1; Herod. 1.1), which was before the Achaeans under Tisamenus migrated to Achaia, as related 2.18.9, sheds glory on the latter. Mythology is not included in the introduction of Book 7.

The introduction to the Laconica (Book 3) is the first long systematic historical account. It occupies twenty-five Teubner pages and serves, in a measure, as a general history of Greece. The wealth of monu-

ments in Athens and Pausanias's desire to deal there with Hellenistic history, combined with the desirability of making a respectable showing for the Lacedaemonians, must, at the outset, have determined him to let Sparta be the chief exponent of general history. He knew from Thucydides 1.10, a passage familiar to him, as is shown by his noted discussion of the political divisions of the Peloponnesus (5.1.1), that Sparta's greatness would never be revealed by her monuments. Even so, he had to find a way of giving this history briefly and, according to his periegetical principle, from the Spartan standpoint. These requirements he found admirably united in the chronological list of Spartan kings by the Laconian Sosibius, and it was comparatively easy to combine with this matter from various sources, as Immerwahr has shown. He has been justly criticized for giving the Agiad and Eurypontid royal lines separately, and thus presenting two parallel sketches of Spartan history. He justifies this by the inequality in the reign of the respective kings, which, indeed, must have been the reason for the existence of separate *ἀναγραφαι*, as we find in Diodorus (7.8: cf. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*², 1.582). The two accounts are partly interlocked and supplementary to each other, presenting an extreme instance of Pausanias's method of dividing and distributing a connected historical account as the same matter was called for in different parts of his work. The Laconian history gradually merges in the Achaean, and appropriately ends with the reign of Cleomenes III, the last of the Spartan kings; but the account of his tyrannical course, his defeat at Sellasia (222 B.C.), and his death in Egypt have already been told in 2.9.1-3, in connection with the life of Aratus, to which passage the reader is referred. In general, it may be added, the Spartan history is presented in a favorable light, the devastation of Attica being charged against individual leaders (cf. 3.7.11; 8.3.6).

The most ambitious historical work of Pausanias is his history of the Messenians, in Book 4, covering seventy-seven Teubner pages. It is usually said that this extended historical account was intended to supply the lack of monuments; but Messenia might have been included in the Laconica, where it receives, as it is, considerable attention, just as Megara is included in the Attica (Book 1) and Corinth in Book 2. Yet in deciding on a separate book he was influenced not merely by the recognition of Messenia as one of the political divisions of the Peloponnesus (5.1.1); but by the important part Messene, the twin city of Megalopolis, played in the history of the Achaean League; and, probably, also by the discovery of the legendary history of the Messenian wars in Myron and Rhianus. His criticism of Myron indicates first-hand knowledge, and we may believe him to have been competent to handle this material (cf.

Hitzig-Bluemner, 4.6 ff.), although E. Schwartz (Hermes 34.457) believes that he depended here on a source of the early Empire. The whole history had to be constructed out of various sources, and marks an important stage in the development of his general plan. This may be seen by comparing a summary of it with his subsequent historical outlines. The problem was largely that of bringing the early Messenian history as close as possible to the later, and connecting this with the history of Megalopolis and the Achaean League, which was accomplished along the line of the various wars, as follows. First came the Trojan War; at the return of the Heraclidae, the Dorians took possession of the country. Cresphontes establishes a line of kings. Causes arise that lead to the Messenian Wars. The first begins 743 B.C.; at its close a number go into exile. The Second Messenian War begins 685 B.C.; it ends with the exile of a part of the inhabitants and the reduction of the rest to the condition of Helots. Here he skips to the Third Messenian War in 464 B.C. Cimon's offer of Athenian aid is rejected by the Spartans (461 B.C.). Naupactus, given by the Athenians, becomes a place of refuge (459 B.C.). The Messenians seize and hold Oeneadae for a year, in 455 B.C. Then follow the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, and the account of the assistance furnished by Messenian slingers (Thucy. 4.36.1 says 'Archers'). The disaster at Aegospotami (405 B.C.) is followed by the expulsion of the Messenians from Naupactus and their departure for Sicily and Libya. The defeat of the Spartans at Leuctra (371 B.C.) is followed by Epaminondas's founding of the city Messene (the account of the founding of Megalopolis is reserved for the Arcadica 7.26 ff.) and the scattered exiles return to their country with much jubilation. Pausanias indulges here in reflections on the long banishment of the Messenians in comparison with the varying fortunes of the Thebans. At first, now, the Lacedaemonians were held in check through fear of the Thebans, but when these become involved in the Phocian War in 356 B.C. (4.28.1; cf. 3.10.3, and the fuller account in 10.2 ff.), the Messenians had to defend themselves with the aid of the Argives and Arcadians, and also to ask assistance of Athens. Finally, they ally themselves with Philip II, and for this reason took no part in the battle of Chaeronea; but when Alexander died they joined the other Greeks against the Macedonians, as was already mentioned in the Attica, in 1.25.4, where an account of the Lamian War has been given. When the Gauls invaded Greece (279-278 B.C.), they did not send a contingent to repel the invaders; but held aloof from fear of Sparta. Not long after, they made a successful attack on Elis, and later repelled an invasion under Demetrius Pharius. They hesitated some time before joining the Achaean League, from fear of

arousing Spartan hostility, but finally joined; when Cleomenes captured Megalopolis they received the fugitive inhabitants. They took part in the battle of Sellasia (222 B.C.), and helped Aratus and the Achaeans in the taking of Sparta. Finally, a difficulty having arisen with the League, they capture Philopoemen; but for the circumstances of his capture and death the reader is referred to the *Ἀρκαδικὸς Λόγος*, i.e. the biography of Philopoemen (8.51.5 ff.).

Taking up now the composition of the *Eliaca*, Books 5-6, we see that Pausanias had here to give space to a vast assemblage of monuments, many of them inviting periegetical notes pertaining to Greek history, or giving the opportunity to record biographies of noted athletes; but the general history of Elis was comparatively unimportant and consequently is disposed of in about one page of Teubner text. This sketch, however, is interesting as the first of its kind (similar ones appear in Books 7-10), in which he rapidly traces the history of a community along the line mainly of the national wars, from the Trojan War down to the period in which Polybius placed the revival of the Achaean League. Here the sketch is brought down to the overthrow, in 271 B.C., of Aristotimus, the tyrant supported by the Athenians.

The idea of such an outline and the ability to give it were the fruit of his previous work, particularly of his laboriously constructed Messenian history; and its tentative character is suggested by Pausanias's words, 5.5.1: *τὰ μὲν δὲ ἐς πόλεμον τοιαῦτα ὑπῆρχεν Ἡλείοις ὡς περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ παρόντι ἀπαριθμῆσαι μετρίως.*

Postponing for the present the consideration of the *Achaica*, we may note that we find in 8.6 a brief sketch of wars in which the Arcadians did or did not take part, beginning with the Trojan War and ending with the invasion of the Gauls, and the remark that the Arcadians most readily of all the Greeks joined the Achaean League. Special history in connection with individual cities is to follow. Not only do Mantinea (8.6 ff.), Megalopolis (27.1 ff.) and Tegea (45.1 ff.) furnish history; but also the village of Nestane (7.4), a *τρόπαιον* of Agis (10.5), and a spot near Mantinea where the cavalry battle of Mantinians and Athenians against Boeotians and Thessalians took place; the account of the last leads to a notice of the death of Epaminondas (11.5). All these digressions deal chiefly with the chosen period of the Achaean League. An episode on the Antonines looks like an insertion (cf. Robert, Pausanias als Schriftsteller, 271 ff.). The five pages on the history of Megalopolis close with its capture by Cleomenes III; for the account of its restoration, etc., the reader is referred to the life of Philopoemen, which Pausanias regarded as Arcadian history (4.29.12) and as a continuation of the history of Messene, as we have seen. It covers some nine Teubner pages, the latter part being an epilogue, in which the merits of Philo-

poemen are set forth in comparison with those of other great national leaders, with the judgment that, as Miltiades was the first of the great benefactors of Greece, so Philopoemen was the last.

Book 9 has no general history of Boeotia, which may be due, as Robert suggests, to the rarity of Boeotian unity. The book, after a few preliminary remarks, begins with the history of Plataea, most of which is connected with Thebes and dates from the seizure of the Cadmea. Thereupon a mythical introduction leads to the history of the latter, which is given after the outline pattern, but it starts with the Persian Wars, as the Trojan War has already been mentioned. It would have been awkward in a general historical sketch to confine a notice of the Trojan War to the Thebans. Pausanias, as we might expect, defends the Thebans for medizing. Most of this Theban history deals with the period from Leuctra to Cassander's restoration of the city. The confiscation of its territory by Sulla (referred to in 7.6.9), and the subsequent restoration of this by the Romans carry the reader to the contemplation of the city's desolate appearance in the time of Pausanias. Most important, however, for the chosen period of history are the seven pages dealing with Epaminondas (9.13.1 ff.), where a detailed account is given of the battle of Leuctra, Epaminondas's invasion of the Peloponnesus, the restoration of Mantinea and the founding of Megalopolis and Messene.

The history of the Phocians, at the beginning of Book 10, gives details of two wars: the Thessalian War, which Busolt (*Griechische Geschichte*², 1.700.1) characterizes as a confused compilation from Herodotus and a source used by Plutarch, and the 'Holy War' for which Timaeus and Hieronymus of Cardia have been thought of as sources. We notice the usual scheme, beginning with the Trojan War and ending with the Gallic invasion; and the significance of this close as a chronological point is emphasized by the fact that the detailed account of the Gauls is reserved for a later occasion (10.5 ff.). The history of the Amphictyonic League brings the Phocian history down to Pausanias's own time, as the history of Elatea does to the invasion of the Costoboci (about 176 A.D.).

If we turn now, finally, to the historical introduction of the *Achaica*, and compare it with Polybius's outline of the early history of the League, we can see how little of the latter suited the purpose of Pausanias. He was interested in the external history of the Achaeans; whereas Polybius described their democratic institutions, and told in general terms how these continued with varying fortunes from their inception, following the overthrow of the monarchical rule of the descendants of Tisamenus, down to Philip II and Alexander, after whom Cassander, Demetrius and Antigonus Gonatas broke up the con-

federation of the twelve cities, placed garrisons in some and helped to establish tyrants in others. Pausanias lets the expulsion of the Ionians from Achaea by Tisamenus and his associates be followed by a digression on the Ionian migration, which develops into a periegetical account of the Ionian cities. No doubt he was glad to seize an opportunity of giving an account of the interesting temples, antiquities and natural advantages of climate, etc., of his own country, where he probably received his first impulse to study the monuments and the geography of Greece, and got the training that prepared him for his periegetical work. We find illustrations from Ionia throughout his book. The justification for this digression is his broad conception of the term Achaeans, which he took in the Homeric sense, and so made to include Ionians (Achaeus and Ion were brothers), as well as Messenians and Argives. The mythology of the latter in Book 2 serves therefore, as already remarked, as an introduction to his Achaean history; and, further, it is in 2.18.6 that we read of Tisamenus's migration to Achaea.

Having completed this account of the Ionians, his fullest account of them, he returns to the Achaeans, who have meanwhile occupied the twelve cities formerly inhabited by the Ionians. While he speaks of the prominence of the sons of Tisamenus and others, he has nothing to say of monarchical government and its termination, and the subsequent history of Achaean democracy. Instead he makes use of his scheme of national wars, which he introduces with the words *τὰ δὲ ἐς πόλεμον τοιαύτη ἦν τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς*. He continues thus: At the time of Agamemnon's expedition against Ilium, the Achaeans, who then inhabited Lacedaemonia and Argos, formed the largest part of the Greek host; but, when Xerxes invaded Greece, it does not appear that the Achaeans took part in the expedition of Leonidas to Thermopylae, nor did they take part with the Athenians and Themistocles in the naval battle at Euboea and Salamis; the Laconian and the Attic lists of allies do not include them. They were also too late for the engagement at Plataea; for, had they taken part there, it is evident that the honor would have been granted the Achaeans of being included in the list of Greeks on the monument at Olympia (cf. 5.23.1 ff.). In my opinion, says Pausanias, those who remained at home protected their own countries; and, besides, owing to their prominence in the Trojan War, they objected to being commanded by Lacedaemonian Dorians. This attitude was shown by them at a later date; for, when the Lacedaemonians began the war against the Athenians, the Achaeans were eager for an alliance with the people of Patrae, and they were no less inclined toward the Athenians. This is a characteristic avoidance of the fact that the Achaeans were on the Spartan side during the latter part of the Peloponnesian War (cf. Thucy. 5.52.3; 2.9.2; Xen. Hell. 3.5.12). In the later general wars, continues Pausanias, the Achaeans took part in the battle of Chaeronea against Philip and the Macedonians; but, they say, they did not take part in the expedition to Thessaly and in the so-called Lamian War; for they had not yet recovered from the disaster in Boeotia. But the native guide of the people of Patrae said that the wrestler Chilon alone of the Achaeans took part in the engagement at Lamia. And I myself know, says Pausanias, that a Lydian named Adrastus, alone and of his own accord, fought for the Greeks, for which the Lydians set up a bronze image of him before the temple of the Persian Artemis, and they wrote an inscription that Adrastus had lost his life fighting against Leonnatus in behalf of the Greeks. When the Gauls invaded Greece, the Achaeans followed the general Peloponnesian policy of trusting to their ability to defend the isthmus of Corinth by drawing a wall from sea to sea, in as much as the barbarians had no ships.

Pausanias now describes the period when Thebes, Sparta and Athens no longer dominated the politics of Greece, and Greek cities were isolated and weak. This condition of affairs favored the expansion of the Achaean League. Reviewing now the foregoing 'history', we notice that the Trojan War makes a good beginning, after which Pausanias uses some of the later national wars as points of vantage from which to make observations as to what the Achaeans were doing at these several times; and, apparently, his negative results are just as much history to him as the solitary instance of their participating in the battle of Chaeronea, and the assistance rendered at Lamia by the solitary citizen of Patrae. The fact is that he did make use of these negative results, for, instead of adopting Polybius's account of the low ebb in the political power of the Achaeans, he thinks of them as comparatively powerful among the Greeks, as they had not suffered from war and pestilence as much as the rest of the Greeks. These generalities bring his narrative to Aratus, following a brief statement as to Aegium, where the Achaeans met in common council (cf. Polyb. 2.38). Now follows a summary of Achaean history that has already been treated in Books 2 and 3, which leads to a characterization of Philip V and his oppression of the Athenians and the Aetolians, and so introduces a restatement of Cephisodorus's embassy to Rome (cf. 1.36.5-6) and the consequent outbreak of the Macedonian War of 200 B.C. The entrance of Rome on the field of action at this point Pausanias recognizes by giving an explanation of the Roman name of their commander Otilius (cf. Hitzig-Bluemner's commentary on 7.7.8). From here on the story of the difficulties the Achaeans had with the Romans, and their ultimate defeat at Corinth is told with some fullness, by

which important gaps in the fragmentary history of Polybius and omissions of Livy are supplied. The sack of Corinth by Mummius reminds Pausanias of Corinthian spoils he had seen at Pergamum. The Romans put an end to the democratic form of government and laid upon the Greeks various restrictions and a tribute. Later, they relented and cancelled the severe measures of Mummius. But a governor was sent, down to Pausanias's time, who was called the governor of Achaea, because the Achaeans had been the leading Greeks at the time of the conquest (this name was probably adopted when the province of Greece was separated from that of Macedonia by Augustus, 27 B.C.). Greece had reached a condition of absolute weakness, having been visited with severe blows of destiny from the beginning: the power of Argos was overthrown by the Dorians; the Attic people, after their recovery from the Peloponnesian War and the devastations of pestilence, were again put down by the Macedonians; the wrath of Alexander the Great had fallen like a thunderbolt on Thebes; the Lacedaemonians received their check from Epaminondas; then the Achaeans gave the last exhibition of Greek political strength, as Pausanias puts it: *ὅτε δὲ καὶ μόγις, ὅτε ἐκ δένδρον λεωβημένον καὶ αὖτον τὰ πλείονα, ἀνεβλάστηθεν ἐκ Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαικόν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἡ κακία τῶν στρατηγησάντων ἐκόλουθεν ἔτι αὔξανόμενον*. Later, Nero relieved them of all their burdens, giving the Roman people (i.e. Senate) the island of Sardinia in exchange; but when in Vespasian's time disorders arose this emperor made them pay tribute again.

GOUCHER COLLEGE, Baltimore, Md. HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

REVIEWS

Aids to Latin Prose Composition. By James A. Kleist. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin and Fauss (1912). Pp. 104.

Hints on Latin Style. By James A. Kleist. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin and Fauss (1913). Pp. 32.

Mr. Kleist's *Aids to Latin Prose Composition* is an attractive little book which ought to prove useful. It is frankly a compilation; the author, by definite references, acknowledges at every step his indebtedness to Potts, Bradley-Arnold, Naegelsbach and Menge. In the method of attacking the problem lies what novelty his book has. It differs from the usual prose manual in that it does not attempt to afford instruction in syntax. Of the three parts into which the difficulties of Latin prose are divided, accident, syntax, idiom, it treats only the last. Indeed, a knowledge of Latin grammar on the part of the student is scarcely demanded by the scope of the work. To that extent we have a new departure in the making of a prose composition book. For a freshman or sophomore class supplementary syn-

tactical drill from other sources would be required. But here matters of idiom, style, word order and the structure of the sentence are discussed. The editor has done the kind of thing which Potts did in his *Hints towards Latin Prose Composition*, or Sidgwick, for Greek prose, in the second half of his *Introduction*. This work differs radically, however, from the familiar English books, with their long introductions on idiom followed by exercises for translation into Latin. The ground usually covered by these introductions is here split up into sixty-two lessons, of fairly uniform length, each independent and hence assignable in any order. A few captions will show the nature of the treatment: under Part I, *Parts of Speech: Concrete Preferred to Abstract Nouns, English Nouns Rendered by Latin Clauses, English Adjectives Rendered by Latin Nouns, The Comparative Used in Superlative Expressions, The Distributive Force of Quisque, Remarks on the Passive Voice, Negative Combinations*, etc.; under Part II, *Structure of Sentences: Normal Word Order, Rhetorical Word Order, The Simple Period, Clauses Which Precede the Principal Verb, Clauses Which Follow*, etc.

The first forty-three lessons deal severally with a single stylistic point and contain (1) illustrative Latin sentences with translation, (2) a statement of the general principle to be taught, (3) exercises for translation, (4) a vocabulary and, often, (5) notes.

The illustrative sentences are excerpted from Caesar and Cicero. This relieves the instructor of American trained pupils from the 'correcting' necessary in using e.g. Bradley-Arnold, a workable book for freshmen, but based largely on Livy. These sentences are turned into idiomatic and spirited English which aptly indicates the principle involved. The general statement which follows the citations is concise and as a rule adequate. All the subjective theorizing which, for first and second year men, lessens the value of Potts's *Hints*, is, of course, eliminated. In short the fact that the sentences plus the translations are nearly self-explanatory is one of the strong features of the book. The exercises for the pupil are in one respect novel: they include the rendering of Latin sentences as well as the usual English ones. This idea seems worthy of consideration. Our labors, as we struggle daily against word for word translation, would be reduced one tenth if we could get any class thoroughly to digest lessons VI, VII, and XIV, on *English Nouns Rendered by Latin Verbs, English Nouns Rendered by Latin Clauses* (or rather the converse of these), and the hourly mangled *magnus, multus* and *summus*. One may criticise the incidental inclusion of rare words, e.g. *indagatrix, expultrix, sensa, assentatiuncula*, in a book intended for first and second year men. Furthermore, the occasional Greek words have no place for this generation which knows not

Greek. Nevertheless the selection is, in general, judicious. The meager English-Latin vocabularies which follow the exercises give little assistance; for it is the evident intention of the author to throw the pupil very much upon his own resources. Opinions will differ here as to what may be taken for granted. The notes are wisely short and deal with exceptions or allied idioms.

Part II consists of nineteen lessons, dealing with word order, the structure of the period and kindred topics. The handling of this material is no better, and no worse, than that found in other manuals and the author deserves praise for shunning refinements. Of the appendix of fourteen pages, twelve pages contain 'fair copies'. The editor, following in the footsteps of Professor Earle, has intrepidly enough offered two versions of the Gettysburg Address in a much more difficult medium than the Greek. The mechanical side of the book is excellent. There are few misprints, the press work is satisfactory and great skill is shown in using to advantage different sizes, shapes and weights of type.

The Hints on Latin Style is a small manual, based upon the larger work and simplified for High School use. No exercises are provided for translation.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. WILLIAM STUART MESSER.

Figurative Uses of Animal Names in Latin and their Application to Military Devices. A Study in Semantics. By Eugene Stock McCartney. University of Pennsylvania Thesis. New Era Printing Company. Lancaster, Pa. (1912). Pp. 56.

In armorum generibus milites sumunt ab animalibus nomina (cf. Servius Aeneid 9.503). This quotation appropriately occupies the title-page of this dissertation, in which "an effort is made to trace the reasons for the transfer of animal names to military machines and devices, both offensive and defensive".

The material and the references are assembled and discussed under the following captions: *aspis, aries, capreoli, caput porci, cervi, chelonium, corax, corvus, cuniculus, equuleus, equus, ericius, grus, lupus, muli, murex, murmillo, musculus, onager, porculus, scorpio, sricula, terebra, testudo, testudo arietaria, tigris*. Greek equivalents (sometimes English) and parallels are often cited; it is therefore to be regretted that a Greek index is not included in the book.

The writer has collected considerable interesting material which is presented with sane commentary.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. LARUE VAN HOOK.

Virgile: Les Bucoliques. Texte latin, publié avec une étude biographique et littéraire, une notice sur la métrique, des notes critiques, un index des noms propres et des notes explicatives, par Frédéric Plessis. Paris: Hachette and Co. (1913). Pp. xxxii + 91. 90 centimes.

This little book is heartily commended to every reader of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY who reads, or ought to read, French. It is the first instalment of a new edition of Vergil which is to replace the old one of Eugène Benoist—a book which has done honorable service, both in and out of France, for the last forty years. The Georgics and the Aeneid are to be edited by Professor Paul Lejay.

The Introduction gives a good account of the poet's life (11 pages) and an admirable critique of the Bucolics (4-½ pages). Two pages are devoted to peculiarities of prosody and meter, and eight pages to critical notes. The Latin text and the notes occupy eighty-nine pages, and the notes are where they should be—directly below the text.

The commentary is clear and concise; it is regularly sound, and regularly sufficient. One explanation is new to me, and I quote it—for what it is worth. It is under the verb *depellere*, Buc. i. 22:

Depellere, voy. plus loin *compellere* 2, 30. Le préfixe *cum* indique l'ensemble; de la séparation d'une partie: on prend au troupeau, pour les mener à la ville, une part des bêtes qui le composent (cf. l'expression *deducere coloniam*).

Professor Plessis is limited in the matter of space, and regularly ignores such theories and explanations as he cannot approve. But he cannot refrain from replying to the critics who have found fault with Vergil for not doing what he never attempted to do, for not being a Roman Theokritos (p. xx). And he has a few sentences which one would like to submit to certain people who can see no independent merit in the Bucolics:

Et quand l'on montrerait qu'un modèle grec a prêté ses grandes lignes à la quatrième Bucolique et qu'il s'y trouve telle ou telle imitation de détail, de qui donc est le ton consulaire et religieux, sinon d'un Romain? de qui l'émotion humaine et civique, sinon de Virgile? de qui l'ombre de mystère et la passion généreuse, sinon d'un grand poète? et de qui, enfin, le charme inexprimable des vers, sinon d'un artiste parfait?

There are too many misprints for the size of the book, though they are all venial offences. I have noticed four in the text (7.9; 8.63; 9.42; 10.12), and some half-dozen others in the notes.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. W. P. MUSTARD.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED MITHRAEUM AT THE BATHS OF CARCALLA

The Baths of Caracalla at Rome are built upon a great artificial platform or terrace, supported upon vaulting below which are numerous subterranean passages or crypts. Some of these underground galleries were already known; others lying west and southwest of the main building of the Baths have been cleared out in connection with the recent excavations. At the northeast end of the apse that is in the middle of the northwest side of the peribolus

wall there was found a fine staircase leading to the lower level. Below is a long corridor giving access to an interesting series of rooms that belonged to what is undoubtedly the best preserved Mithraeum in existence. At the entrance of the temple proper is a square room, the pronaos. The doorway entering the sanctuary is well marked. The Mithraeum is divided into three divisions, the central nave, and, on either side, low bases sloping toward the side walls; upon these bases the worshippers reclined to view the initiation rites. The bases are about three feet high and in front of them runs a long seat, slightly lower, on which the various orders of the priests may have sat. The roof is supported by six heavy pillars, three on each side of the nave. The floor of the nave is in black and white mosaic. Low down on the face of the bases above described are cut four semi-circular niches in which doubtless lamps were placed which cast a dim light in the otherwise dark chamber.

Near the entrance of the temple is a round opening in the floor containing a large terracotta jar with a cover of marble; in this may have been the water for the purifying ablutions. Farther along is a square crypt about six feet deep communicating by an underground passage with the adjoining room (see below). This crypt is explained as the place where the new initiate was baptised with the blood of the bull slain in the sanctuary above.

At the end wall opposite the main doorway is a base about ten inches high terminating on one side in a triangle. Above, in the wall, was a niche occupied, it is believed, by a transparent slab of marble representing Mithras slaying the bull; numerous fragments of this slab have been found.

At the left of the sanctuary, as one faces the main entrance, is the sacristy, and at the right are two rooms connected with the cult. In the first, lighted by a window is a staircase that leads down to the secret passage communicating with the crypt in the temple; higher up a small opening passes through the thick partition wall, through which the priest speaking could convey to the worshippers on the other side the impression that they were listening to the utterances of the god himself. The other room, also lighted by a window, has a long bench not far from three feet high, which runs along one side. In this room the animals for sacrifice may have been kept or the initiates may here have dressed and prepared themselves for the ceremony.

Mithraic inscriptions in Greek were found in the excavation of the site. In the sacristy a nude female statue, probably of Venus, was brought to light.

At the west angle of the peribolus wall of the Baths a large rectangular-shaped hall has been excavated and identified as a library. It has the orientation prescribed by Vitruvius, it is isolated, and

has in the walls rows of niches for book-cases (*armaria*). Excavations will be made during the winter in the reservoir section of the Baths.

WALTER DENNISON.

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

- American Review of Reviews—Jan., Much of the Ancient World's Art yet Undiscovered.
- Athenaeum—Jan. 17, (Westaway, Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin): Notices (VanLeeuwen, Ilias, V. 2—Royds, The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil): The Classical Association; Jan. 24, (Edmundson, The Church in Rome in the First Century): Lesbia's "Sparrow", W. G. Black (*Passere solitario*, the blue rock thrush); Jan. 31, Literary Gossip—Memorial slab to Andrew Lang in the University of St. Andrew's, with Greek inscription by Alexander Shewan.
- Bibelot (Portland, Me.)—Jan. and Feb., Orpheus and Eurydice, Vernon Lee.
- Contemporary Review—Feb., (Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism).
- Dial—Jan. 16, Recent Poetry (much of it on classical themes); Feb. 1, (Allinson, Roads from Rome): Revivifying the Classics, N. H. Dole.
- Educational Review—Feb., Discussions—The New Testament as a reference Document in the Teaching of Roman History, E. A. Hecker.
- English Historical Review—Jan., Notes and Documents—St. Boniface's Poem to Nithardus (Lat. text), M. R. James; Pistorius, Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos (W. A. Goligher); Tofrali, Topographie de Thessalonique au xiv^e siècle (J. B. Bury); Short Notices (Canfield, Early Persecutions of the Christians—Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, iv, 2).
- Independent—Feb. 2, The Reclamation of the Pontine Marshes (ill.).
- Mind—Jan., Aristotle's Refutation of 'Aristotelian' Logic, F. C. S. Schiller: Discussions—Aristotle's Theory of Tragic Emotion, A. W. Benn.
- Modern Language Notes—Feb., Correspondence—Robert Greene and the Italian Translation of Achilles Tatius, Joseph de Perott: Brief Mention—(Schevill, Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain).
- Nation (New York)—Jan. 29, (Boucher, L'Anabase de Xenophon, avec un commentaire historique et militaire).
- Revue Historique—Jan.-Feb., Bulletin historique—Antiquités chrétiennes, Ch. Guignebert: (Rodocanachi, Les Monuments de Rome après la chute de l'empire, Ch. Bémont).
- Saturday Evening Post—Jan. 24, The Goldfish, Modern Education and Superficial Culture.
- Saturday Review—Dec. 13, (Lord Cromer, Political and Literary Essays): (Gulielmi Shakespeare Carmina quae Sonnets nuncupantur Latine reddita ab A. T. Barton); Jan. 3, (T. F. Royds, The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil).
- School Review—Jan., Discussion: Effect of the Non-Requirement of Latin for Graduation upon the Latin Classes of the High School, W. R. Pate.
- Scientific American Supplement—Jan. 31, A Scythian Chief's Tomb Unearthed Intact after Two Thousand Years, G. A. Bobrinsky (ill.).
- Spectator—Jan. 24, (Delbrück, Numbers in History); Jan. 31, A Reference in Juvenal.
- Times (London), Educational Supplement—Jan. 6, Correspondence—The Study of Greek, W. H. D. Rouse: The Pronunciation of Latin, A. D. Godley: Latin and Modern Usage: Grammatical Terminology.
- Literary Supplement—Jan. 30, "The Golden Bough" Completed.
- Times (London), Weekly Ed., Lit. Supplement—Jan. 2, The Campagna (Arnaldo Cervasato, The Roman Campagna).
- Yale Review—Jan., (The Loeb Classical Library, W. L. Cross).